

[5th March 1925]

(e) whether it is a fact that a sum of Rs. 5,000 only was sanctioned by the Government to relieve the distress among the public in the Coimbatore district during the recent heavy floods ;  
 (f) whether the Government propose to increase the amount ; and  
 (g) which parts of Coimbatore district and other districts are affected seriously ?

**A.—(a), (b) & (g)** A <sup>a</sup> statement containing the information is laid on the table.

(c) & (e) The amount sanctioned for the immediate relief of distress in the several districts was—

	RS.
Malabar	20,000
Coimbatore	5,000
Trichinopoly	5,000
Tanjore	5,000
The Nilgiris	250

(d) In addition to the amounts granted for the immediate relief of distress, free grants of building materials were made wherever practicable to the poor for reconstruction of their houses. A grant of Rs. 1,25,000 was obtained from the Indian Peoples' Famine Trust and placed at the disposal of the Central Flood Relief Committee for distribution in the flood-affected areas. Loans at the concession rate of 4 per cent are being granted for the purchase of cattle and seed grain and for rebuilding houses. Loans for reclamation of silted lands are also being granted at the concession rate of 4 per cent for the first two years and of 6 per cent thereafter. Remission of assessment will be granted in respect of lands which are covered with sand and rendered unfit for cultivation by the floods until they are cultivable, this concession being extended even to portions of survey fields or recognized subdivisions if the area affected be not less than one acre in extent.

(f) No.

*The anicut across the Noyal, Coimbatore district.*

\* 373 Q.—**Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR** : Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether a portion of the anicut across the Noyal from which water is taken to the Pallapalayam tank in the Palladam taluk of Coimbatore district was washed away during the last year's flood ;  
 (b) whether the ryots have sent several petitions to the Revenue and Public Works Department authorities and they have also finally sent a memorial to Government ;  
 (c) whether the estimates have been prepared and sanctioned and if so when the repairing work is expected to be taken up and finished ; and  
 (d) whether the ryots have also applied for a remission and the remission of the whole or a portion of the kist for the lands irrigated by water from this anicut has been recommended by the revenue authorities and on what principles the recommendation, if any, has been based ?

<sup>a</sup> Printed as Appendix I on pages 875-876 infra.

5th March 1925]

**A.—(a)** Yes.

(b) Government received a memorial on the subject on the 3rd February, but have no information as to whether several petitions were addressed to the local Revenue and Public Works authorities.

(c) In November last the local officers reported that the breaches would be closed as soon as floods in the Noyal river subsided and the monsoon changed. A further report on the progress of the work is awaited.

(d) The Government have no information.

### Police.

*Alleged high-handed action of a Sub-Inspector of Police at Wallaja.*

\* 374 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that one Mr. C. V. Rajagopalachari of Vellore brought, in September 1923, to the notice of the Deputy Magistrate of Ranipet, giving the dates, the names and other particulars of the high-handed acts, some instances of high-handed action on the part of the Sub-Inspector of Police at Wallaja and the village munsif of Kolatheri in Wallaja taluk of North Arcot district;

(b) whether it is a fact that, on receipt of the above communication, the Subdivisional Magistrate turned against the said Mr. C. V. Rajagopalachari and threatened proceedings against him; and

(c) whether the Subdivisional Magistrate held any inquiry into the alleged high-handed acts, and if so, when and how the inquiry was held and what witnesses were examined?

**A.—(a), (b) & (c)** The Government have no information.

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—“The allegation is a very serious one. Will the hon. the Law Member call for the information?”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Yes.”

### General.

*Exportation of monkeys.*

\* 375 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any communication from the Government of India regarding the exportation of monkeys; and

(b) if so, what opinion has been formed and forwarded, and whether the Government will be pleased to lay the correspondence on the matter on the table?

**A.—(a)** Yes.

(b) The Government of India referred to a Press report which mentioned the export of monkeys from Lucknow district. They were informed that the Government of Madras had no knowledge of any traffic in monkeys in the Madras Presidency.